

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 11, 2007, Applicants hereby thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended by the Examiner to the Applicants' representatives during the Examiner Interview conducted on January 25, 2008.

The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated October 11, 2007 and also incorporate the points discussed during the January 25 personal interview. Claims 1,2, 5-9, and 12-17 are pending. Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are presented for reconsideration and Claims 7-9 and 12-17 are withdrawn. By this Amendment, Claims 1-2 are amended and Claims 10-11 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 2 can be found on at least page 14, lines 4-7 and 20-25 of the Specification as originally filed. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In a manner believed to be responsive to the rejection and as discussed during the January 25 personal interview, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 2. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,691,876) in view of Hisamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,027,629). To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following

reason(s).

Claim 1, as amended, recites an electrostatic chucking device having, among other features, an adhesive layer between the aluminum alloy metal substrate and the first insulation layer wherein the adhesive layer includes a diamino siloxane-modified thermoplastic polyimide-based adhesive film having a film thickness of 5 to 50 μm and a compression bonding temperature of 100 to 200°C.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Chen and Hisamoto fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in Claim 1. Chen teaches siloxane-modified polyimides based on aromatic tetracarboxylic acid dianhydride, aromatic diamine and trialkoxy silane (see column 10, lines 61-63), whereas the siloxane-modified polyimide of Claim 1 involves aromatic tetracarboxylic acid dianhydride, aromatic diamine and diamino siloxane (see page 14, lines 22-25 of the Specification as originally filed). Claim 1 recites the particular adhesive because the adhesive film has a particular material characteristic that enables the film to be low pressure compression bonded at a low temperature. Chen and Hisamoto do not disclose, teach or suggest such an adhesive because neither is concerned with an adhesive film having characteristics or features that allow the film to be bonded at such a temperature.

Therefore, not only do Chen and Hisamoto not render Claim 1 obvious because they do not teach or suggest the features recited therein, but one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider it obvious to modify Chen in view of Hisamoto because to do so would render the modified Chen ineffective for its intended use. Chen specifically teaches using a thermoplastic polyimide film in which “bonding is accomplished above 280° C, and DuPont recommends bonding at 350° C” (column 7, lines 12-13) or a

"polyimide siloxane cured at a temperature of 300° C or more" (column 11, lines 8-9).

Hisamoto teaches using an aluminum alloy substrate. It is the high-temperature material characteristic of the Chen adhesive films that has a detrimental impact on the aluminum alloy metal substrate of Hisamoto so that one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider it obvious to modify Chen in view of Hisamoto.

Applicants submit that Claim 1 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references. As discussed above, Chen and Hisamoto do not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in Claim 1 and the combination of Chen and Hisamoto do not render Claim 1 obvious. Claims 2, 5 and 6 depend from Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are not rendered unpatentable over Chen in view of Hisamoto and should be deemed allowable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of the Claims 1-2 and 5-6 and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 101160-00026.**

Respectfully submitted,



William D. Doyle
Attorney for Applicants
Registration Number 60,429

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

WDD/elp